Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
OCT 24 1980
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

No. 79-1320

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

RAYMOND KASSEL, *et al.*,
Appellants,

v.

CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS CORPORATION OF DELAWARE,
A Delaware Corporation,
Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

---

REPLY BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

THOMAS J. MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa

MARK E. SCHANTZ
Solicitor General
Hoover State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
(515) 281-5191

ROBERT W. GOODWIN
Special Assistant Attorney General

LESTER A. PAFF
Assistant Attorney General

Attorneys for Appellants

WILSON - EPES PRINTING CO., INC. - 789-0096 - WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ARGUMENT	1
I. Restatement of the case	1
II. Iowa's limitations on truck length are safety regulations	6
III. The border city provision is not discriminatory and does not trivialize Iowa's concern for safety	12
IV. The legislative branch is competent to decide policy questions involving the balancing of safety and efficiency	14
CONCLUSION	16
APPENDIX	1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: Page

Bibb v. *Navajo Freight Lines*, 359 U.S. 520 (1959) 12

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen v. *Chicago R.I. & P.R. Co.*, 393 U.S. 129 (1968) .. 15

Raymond Motor Trans., Inc. v. *Rice*, 434 U.S. 429 (1978) 7, 9, 14-16

Southern Pacific Co. v. *Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761 (1945) 6-9

Miscellaneous:

Tushnet, *Rethinking the Dormant Commerce Clause*, 1979 Wis.L.Rev. 125 12

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

No. 79-1320

RAYMOND KASSEL, *et al.*,
Appellants,

v.

CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS CORPORATION OF DELAWARE,
A Delaware Corporation,
Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

---

REPLY BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

ARGUMENT

I. RESTATEMENT OF THE CASE.

Once upon a time, the trucking world was dark. Shippers could send their goods to other states only by rail or in unsafe and expensive 55-foot semis and 60-foot twin trailers. Then, out of the West, came the greatest technological breakthrough since the internal combustion engine—the 65-foot twin trailer. It was adopted universally. Shipping rates declined. Accidents nearly disappeared. Owners of Volkswagen "Bugs" formed a "65-foot Twin Fan Club."

This blissful state of nature persisted for many years. Life was good. Then, from the primitive swamp between the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, emerged a dark figure, controlled by those enemies of progress, the American Automobile Association and the Des Moines Register. With one brutal blast of his black pen, Governor Robert Ray "banned" the "industry standard" and plunged the "national transportation system" [1] into chaos from which it can emerge only if the living Commerce Clause devours state length limitations.

Iowa does not borrow from the Brothers Grimm merely to lighten this mirthless litigation. Rather, we deliberately exaggerate CF's claims in an effort to illustrate that the use of imprecise, emotion-laden terminology can warp perspective. Resort to the record will restore perspective on two background questions. Does Iowa "ban" 65-foot twins? In what relevant sense, if any, is the 65-foot twin the "industry standard" or otherwise essential to the "national transportation system?"

The movement toward larger vehicles accelerated after World War II. (A. 93-94). The twin-trailer configuration appeared in significant numbers in the early 1950's. In California, for example, twin trailers have been permitted since 1950. From 1950 to 1959, 60-foot twins were the longest allowed in California; 65-foot twins have been permitted since 1959. (A. 49).

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) has recommended regulatory standards on a variety of matters, including vehicle length, for many years. From 1946 until 1963, the AASHTO recommended limit for twins was 60 feet; since 1963 the recommendation has been 65 feet.[2] Most

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, Appellee's Brief at 21.

[2] Three charts entitled "Legal Maximum Dimensions and Weights of Motor Vehicles Compared With AASHTO Standards," which

western and midwestern states have increased the length limit for twins to 65 feet: Kansas and Nebraska in 1965 (A. 65, 82), Illinois in 1967 (designated routes) (A. 62), and Minnesota in 1973 (A. 58). To the present time, at least 18 states have declined to modify their regulations to permit the operation of 65-foot vehicles on their highways. (A. 645).

Iowa authorized the operation of 60-foot twin trailers in 1963, after having previously increased the limit three times since 1945.[3] In 1974, the Iowa General Assembly sent to Governor Robert Ray a bill increasing the length limit for twins to 65 feet. The Governor vetoed the bill. (A. 420). Later in the session the Governor signed a bill permitting cities adjacent to other states, at their option, to borrow the length limit prevalent in the adjoining state. (A. 422). To summarize, Iowa has never left vehicle length unregulated; nor has it authorized 65-foot twins. Thus, it has never been necessary affirmatively to outlaw ("ban") the vehicles CF prefers to operate.

Iowa does not dispute that those general commodity carriers which have extensive operations in states which permit 65-foot twins have invested heavily in 27 or 28-foot boxes rather than the 24-foot boxes that were employed with the 60-foot twins. But it is not true that there is some particular box with unique physical properties which all carriers do or must acquire; purchasing a trailer box is not like purchasing a Mercedes 450 SL. Manufacturers will provide boxes in any length ordered

---

reveal the evolution of its policy concerning the length of twins, are set forth as an Appendix to this Reply Brief. These charts are earlier versions of Exhibit 511, which appears at A. 645.

[3] The history of § 321.457 is summarized in 15A Iowa Code Ann. 249 (West 1966).

(A. 92) and CF orders its trailers built to its own specifications (A. 344-45).

Indeed, trailer boxes in the 26 to 28-foot range have never commanded a dominant share of the total market for trailing equipment.[4] CF did not provide comprehensive data establishing the percentage of general commodities transported on 65-foot twins. CF itself carried a substantially greater percentage of its freight in semis in 1977 than it did in 1974, primarily because it has expanded its operation into an area where 65-foot twins are not authorized. (A. 349).

The record provides no technological basis for any suggestion that a 65-foot twin is superior to a 60-foot twin scaled down to otherwise identical specifications. All of the supposed advantages of twins over semis (Appellee's Brief at 1-2) are present with 60-foot twins. (A. 239). A 60-foot twin is to a 65-foot twin as a long truck is to a longer truck. Period.

CF's own witnesses make clear that the principal determinants of the length and configuration of equipment operated by general commodity carriers are state laws and the region(s) of the country where a carrier has its largest operation. (A. 92, 240, 364-65). This is conceded with respect to Roadway Express, Inc. (Appellee's Brief at 48). There is no national standard in any *technological* sense. And, because there is nothing like national uniformity in length *regulation*, it cannot fairly be said that Iowa is out of step with *any* national standard.

---

[4] Calvin Dep. at 27-42; Calvin Dep. Ex. #5. This exhibit is dated September, 1976 and is a mailing from the Truck Trailer Manufacturer's Association to its members setting forth the results of a recent survey on van trailer production. The sample suggested the following percentages of trailers in the 26 to 28-foot range were produced in each of the following years: 1946-23.5%; 1956-1.1%; 1966-15.4%; 1976-8.6%.

A fair and accurate perspective on these matters generates questions about CF's position on the issues. Was Iowa's 60-foot limitation unconstitutional at its enactment in 1963? If so, would it not be only because all length limitations everywhere are unconstitutional, a contention CF purports to disavow? (Appellee's Brief at 20). If, on the other hand, it has somehow become unconstitutional since 1963, what has caused this profound change? Was it the change in the AASHTO standards? Was it the action in that time of 15 or 20 states to increase their length limit to 65 feet? Was it Governor Ray's veto of a bill that would have increased Iowa's limit? Was it the enactment of the so-called "border cities exception?" Was it the 1975 Iowa DOT Study? Was it increased research by the Western Highway Institute into the comparative safety of twin trailers and semitrailers? Was it the increased use of Interstate 80 for transporting freight? Certainly these factors are not of a type that have previously been given weight in Commerce Clause jurisprudence. Iowa submits that the proper focus is upon whether the length limitation for twin trailers adopted by the Iowa legislature in 1963 is inherently burdensome to interstate commerce.

With a fair and accurate perspective on the factual and legal background, it is apparent that the only advantage of a 65-foot twin over the vehicles authorized for use on Iowa's highways is the greater volume of freight which the longer trailers will accommodate. (A. 119-20).[5] Small increases in efficiency are not unimportant, but CF does not dispute that if Iowa's length limitation may be fairly characterized as a safety regulation, it should survive the Commerce Clause balancing test. (Appellee's Brief at 5, 16). Iowa respectfully submits,

---

[5] The theoretical increase in volume is approximately 10 per cent, but CF did not demonstrate that it could fully utilize the increased volume. (Meyers Dep. at 37-39).

therefore, that this Court should direct its primary attention to the question whether CF has demonstrated that Iowa's length limitation is unrelated to safety. If so, CF should prevail; if not, Iowa should prevail.

II. IOWA'S LIMITATIONS ON TRUCK LENGTH ARE SAFETY REGULATIONS.

Iowa's position on this central issue is set out at length in Appellant's Brief at 11-30 and need not be fully repeated here. Rather, Iowa would respond to the three contentions we understand CF now to make: 1) all length limitations are negatively correlated with safety because they require carriers to travel more miles, 2) Iowa's length limitation is negatively correlated with safety because it "diverts" traffic around Iowa, and 3) a length limitation is valid if, but only if, a state can demonstrate that all vehicle types which may operate on its highways are "safer" than all vehicles which are excluded by the regulation.

A. At several points in its brief, CF appears to contend that longer trucks are necessarily safer trucks. Asserting that *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761 (1945), rests upon the simple syllogism that "shorter trains meant more trains, and more trains, more accidents," CF proceeds to argue: "This case is like *Southern Pacific*. If 65-foot twins are safe vehicles, Iowa's ban increases the number of accidents associated with interstate traffic by increasing vehicle miles." (Appellee's Brief at 6, 13-15).

If this is truly their position, it has far reaching implications and is plainly inconsistent with CF's disclaimer: "CF does not contend that length limits never promote safety, nor does it contend that Iowa does not possess the power to impose length limits." (Appellee's Brief at 20). If longer trucks are necessarily safer trucks, then all length limits are perversely irrational.

Legislatures should be *requiring* rather than *prohibiting* the use of 85-foot vehicles. And, length limitations could not survive due process scrutiny, much less the Commerce Clause balancing test.

If this is CF's position, it rests upon the fallacy of single-variable analysis: *all other things being equal*, longer trucks mean fewer trucks, fewer trucks mean fewer miles and fewer miles mean fewer accidents. The "all other things being equal" constraint requires the assumption that length is not related to safety in any other respect than reducing the number of trucks required by some, possibly de minimus, amount. That assumption is precisely the point in issue herein and CF neither pleaded nor proved that length bears no other relationship to safety.

Logically, CF's argument is identical in form to a claim that speed limits are necessarily negatively related to safety. All other things being equal, it is doubtless true that the longer time spent on the highway, the greater risk of involvement in an accident. A person who drives across Iowa at 80 miles per hour can do so in about 4 hours; a person travelling 60 miles per hour requires at least 5 hours. By analogy to CF's theory, the person travelling 60 miles per hour encounters a 25 per cent greater likelihood of an accident. Most people reject that conclusion because, believing that speed is related to safety other than merely with respect to time on the highway, they know one should not assume all other things are equal.

After relying primarily on *Raymond Motor Trans. Inc.* v. *Rice*, 434 U.S. 429 (1978), throughout these proceedings, CF is now sharply critical of certain propositions in *Raymond* which it finds contrary to its theory (Appellee's Brief at 5, 11, 18, 41) and apparently disposed to shift its reliance to *Southern Pacific*. Iowa

would contend that *Southern Pacific* is not suited to highway use.

As previously noted, the issue of legislative fact in *Southern Pacific* was whether the length of trains was generally related to their safety; the ultimate issue was whether train length should be totally unregulated by the states. CF did not plead and has not proved that truck length is unrelated to safety; CF continues to deny that a decision affirming the court below would terminate all state regulation of vehicle length. (Appellee's Brief at 20).

Moreover, this Court in *Southern Pacific* did not rely on the "all other things being equal" formula now advanced by CF to conclude that limiting the length of trains, viewed in terms of its "total effect as a safety measure," was ineffective. In addition to other evidence, this Court relied heavily on a direct comparison of the accident experience in Nevada, which did not regulate train length, with Arizona, which did. Nevada had significantly fewer accidents. 321 U.S. at 778. CF tendered no comparable proof, no evidence even suggesting that accident rates are lower in Wyoming, with its 85-foot limit, than in Georgia, with its 55-foot limit. Nor did CF tender an expert who was willing to state that total safety will improve if length is unregulated.

Even were CF's attempted analogy to *Southern Pacific* otherwise apposite, CF ignores key factual and legal distinctions between trucking and railroading. A key difference in safety terms is that only trains run on railroad tracks. Trucks must share, albeit reluctantly at times, use of the highways with small cars. Any safety problems involving long trains would reveal themselves in accidents involving trains. But long trucks may cause accidents in which the truck is not physically involved and which, therefore, are not reported as truck accidents. When CF attempts to focus exclusively on whether the

65-foot twin is "a safe vehicle," (Appellee's Brief at 6), it appears to ignore these safety concerns for other highway users.

Finally, this Court has consistently treated state regulation of railroads differently from state regulation of highways with respect to burdens on interstate commerce. The point was made emphatically in *Southern Pacific*, 325 U.S. at 783, and reaffirmed in *Raymond*, 434 U.S. at 444, n. 18. CF complains that the Court's distinction between "local" and "national" subjects of commerce is insufficiently explanatory (Appellant's Brief at 14). Perhaps so, but Congress has been aware that a distinction between highways and railroads has prevailed with this Court for 60 years and has not been moved to intervene.

B. If CF's contention is not that all length limitations increase the risk of accidents, then their contention collapses into the more concrete, but also flawed, claim that any state limitation which "diverts" interstate traffic increases the risk of accidents. This is simply a new variation on their "burden analysis" and necessarily involves double-counting. CF would have this Court attribute to the State of Iowa both the economic costs alleged to stem from the "diversion" and the theoretical increase in accidents predicted from travelling the longer routes around Iowa. But, as we have previously argued, CF could transport freight through Iowa in 55-foot semis or in 60-foot twins, vehicles which are or have been in CF's fleet. CF now seldom does that because they have determined that it costs less to route their 65-foot twins around Iowa. Having made this election for economic reasons and having disregarded the alleged safety factor in reaching the decision, CF cannot then attribute to Iowa's length limitation the "safety burden on national interests." Put differently, CF cannot choose a longer route for economic reasons, ignore the safety factor, and then claim that Iowa's length limitation causes

both an economic and a safety burden on interstate carriers.[6]

C. CF expends much energy on appeal, as it did at trial, in support of the proposition that 65-foot twins, which Iowa does not allow on its highways, are as safe as 55-foot semis, which are allowed. Perhaps our prior statement was unclear, but Iowa concedes that the available evidence does not indicate any gross differences in safety based upon *configuration* between doubles and semis. (Appellant's Brief at 28). Indeed, Iowa would not ask this Court to review such a comparatively narrow question of adjudicative fact. Rather Iowa contends that the proper issue is whether length is generally related to safety as a matter of legislative fact. It is just this misformulation of the issue in the courts below which is the basis for this appeal.

In this respect, Iowa has argued that to permit such a misleadingly specific attack on length limitations is to condone the "salami tactics" by which all length limitations would be eliminated, five short feet at a time. CF's response is to suggest that, were it to challenge the 65-foot length limitation prevailing in a number of states, it would be doomed to failure because a sufficient burden on interstate commerce could not be established. (Appellee's Brief at 21). This suggestion speaks volumes concerning the nature of CF's burden argument in this case, i.e., it is totally dependent upon first persuading some unspecified number of legislatures to increase their limit and then selecting equipment the maximum length permitted by law. As previously noted, CF could not establish a comparable burden in Georgia, which also "bans" 65-foot twins, because the vehicle is not the "in-

---

[6] Iowa contends that it is inappropriate to attribute *either* burden to its length limitation. See Brief for Appellants at 35-37. The diversion of equipment around Iowa stems from CF's voluntary business decisions and legislative changes by Iowa's neighbors.

dustry standard" there. Were there anything of substance to CF's burden claim, it would endanger a 65-foot limit, an 85-foot limit and any other limit in every state. For all that appears, however, CF's burden claim is essentially a play on words and should endanger other limitations no more than it threatens Iowa's.

CF's response to Iowa's example of salami tactics drawn from the width limitation context is also revealing. CF purports to concede that a challenge to an eight-foot width limitation by a carrier with an eight-foot, three-inch long vehicle would fail because eight feet is the "standard" width. (Appellee's Brief at 21). How many states would have to increase the limit to eight feet, three inches and how much wider equipment must be purchased before the limitation becomes vulnerable? CF's theory is faulty because it rests not upon any objective, external standard to which Iowa should conform, but rather upon an indeterminate reference, subject to change at any time by the legislatures of a few other states and CF's voluntary business decisions. Citizens of Iowa should be subject to rules formulated by a majority in Congress or by the Iowa General Assembly; they should not be subject to length limitations fashioned by a majority of the Illinois and Nebraska Legislatures and a majority of CF's board of directors.

CF also responds to Iowa's width limitation example by asserting that an impermissible burden on interstate commerce would be created were Iowa to *reduce* the width limitation to seven feet, nine inches. Without stating flatly that such a change in regulation would be unconstitutional, Iowa certainly would concede that a *reduction* in the limit is a different case and that heightened judicial scrutiny would be warranted for two reasons. First, if carriers have selected equipment in *reliance* on a particular width limit, changing to a more stringent regulation begins to resemble a "taking" of property without

due process of law. Second, a state which has operated with a liberal dimension limit perhaps should be expected to justify by "newly discovered evidence" its reasons for adopting a stricter limitation.

But that is not this case. Iowa has not reduced its length limit. CF could not have relied upon an implied representation that longer vehicles would be permitted in Iowa. That is why Iowa objects to CF's use of the term "ban"—a term which may misleadingly connote that Iowa took affirmative steps to outlaw 65-foot twins. And, *inter alia*, that is why *Bibb* v. *Navajo Freight Lines, Inc.*, 359 U.S. 520, 525 (1959) is inapposite here. In *Bibb*, Illinois affirmatively required a novel type of mudflap when it had previously *required* a type legal in nearly all other states.[7] Here, CF is asking the federal courts to repeal a length limitation statute on the theory that the Iowa legislature's *inaction* is constitutionally unacceptable.

III. THE BORDER CITY PROVISION IS NOT DISCRIMINATORY AND DOES NOT TRIVIALIZE IOWA'S CONCERN FOR SAFETY.

CF argues that the "exception" to Iowa's 60-foot limitation for border cities who choose to borrow the limit of an adjacent state constitutes discrimination against interstate commerce. In most respects, this argument seems beside the point. One would suppose that the remedy for a "discriminatory" exception would be to hold the exception invalid and require Iowa to apply its limitation uniformly.[8] CF does not seek that remedy and has neither alleged nor proved facts which would give it standing to

---

[7] *Bibb* is also distinguishable because the Illinois requirements *conflicted* with those in other states; carriers were required to change equipment. Here, the 60-foot twins lawful in Iowa may be operated wherever CF may operate 65-foot twins.

[8] Tushnet, *Rethinking the Dormant Commerce Clause*, 1979 Wis.L.Rev. 125, 159.

raise the claim. Nonetheless, Iowa will reply briefly to CF's attack on the border cities provision because of the suggestion that the very existence of the provision renders "trivial" the safety justification for the general limitation. (Appellee's Brief at 42).

Iowa explained in its opening brief that the District Court had found the border city provision nondiscriminatory, that CF produced no evidence that this provision eliminates local *hardships* created by the 60-foot limitation, and that intuitively the provision seemed equally to accommodate out-of-state carriers and shippers who generally employ overlength vehicles.[9] Of course, Iowa shippers in certain border cities may have their commodities shipped in 65-foot twins, at the discretion of the carrier, and at the same rate as they would be carried on 60-foot twins.

CF responds with outrage to this analysis, claiming "the record shows that economic benefit to Iowa shippers was the impetus for the border city exemption." (Appellee's Brief at 42). In support of that statement, CF cites a passage from Governor Ray's veto message concerning a bill which would have permitted 65-foot twins on all highways in Iowa and then notes that the legislature passed the border city provision shortly thereafter. We are not advised how one may infer the *legislature's* reasons for *adopting* a provision which might result in limited use of 65-foot vehicles from the Governor's reasons for *vetoing* a bill broadly *authorizing* longer trucks. With all due respect, the suggested inference is a complete non sequitur.

CF then notes that laws which achieve advantages for one state's interstate commerce over the interstate commerce of other states offend the Commerce Clause. Iowa

---

[9] The background of the border city provision is discussed by Dennis Ehlert, Director of Motor Vehicle Enforcement, Iowa DOT. (A. 414-17).

agrees. But it is not self-evident, and CF does not prove, that the border city provision has this effect. There is no a priori reason to believe Iowa firms in border cities ship more commodities to out-of-state destinations in 65-foot vehicles than enter Iowa border city markets on 65-foot vehicles. Internal cities like Des Moines, Cedar Rapids and Waterloo may neither export nor import commodities on 65-foot vehicles. Thus, CF's attempted analogy with Wisconsin's interplant permit exemption in *Raymond*, 434 U.S. at 446 n. 24, does not fit. That exemption did not give out-of-state firms access to Wisconsin markets on an equivalent basis.

Finally, CF's broad contention that any deviation from a uniform length limitation trivilizes the safety concern will not withstand analysis. For example, this past summer, Iowa issued a permit allowing an indivisible 139-foot, 170-ton accelerator to be transported from Argonne Laboratories in Illinois to Stanford University via Interstate 80. Detailed conditions specified the particulars of the journey. Iowa recognized the lack of alternatives (necessity) and required the trip to be as safe as reasonably possible. Doubtless it posed a greater hazard than an unrestricted single trip with a 65-foot twin. Yet there is no inconsistency here. It is not inconsistent to respond differently to different situations.

IV. THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IS COMPETENT TO DECIDE POLICY QUESTIONS INVOLVING THE BALANCING OF SAFETY AND EFFICIENCY.

CF makes a curious attack on the lawmaking capability of the legislative branch of government: "a legislature is a poorly constituted body to make a factual judgment as to whether or not a regulation promotes safety." (Appellee's Brief at 12). Is it unfair to ask whether this remark applies to those legislatures the industry has persuaded to increase the length limitation to 65 feet or whether it is confined to the Iowa legislature? In

any event, the point of the remark is apparently to suggest that the federal courts are better suited for this type of work.

Iowa has no quarrel with a court affording CF an opportunity to prove that the stated justification for a statute, in this case safety, is not the real reason, i.e., to prove that length is unrelated to safety. As demonstrated above, this CF has not done. But Iowa does submit that it was inappropriate for the courts below to accept CF's invitation to second-guess the legislature in drawing a particular line. Line-drawing does not involve safety alone; line-drawing, in this context and others, necessarily involves the weighing of competing interests and the making of judgments on incomplete information. Put differently, line-drawing involves questions of policy, not pure questions of fact. Perhaps the point can be clarified in this way: if safety were the only variable to be considered in establishing a length limitation, one would expect trucks to be the same length as cars. (Crawford Dep. at 9). It is only by weighing economic factors along with safety that the Iowa legislature has decided to permit trucks of a length it does. This Court has consistently indicated that federal courts should not second-guess legislative weighing of interests, at least unless the burden on interstate commerce overwhelms a marginal concern for safety. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen* v. *Chicago, R.I. & P.R.R. Co.*, 393 U.S. 129, 138-39 (1968).

Iowa has previously argued that the *Brotherhood* principle is sufficiently protective of national economic interests because Congress may assert its primary authority over interstate commerce should it determine that a state legislature regulates too stringently. Iowa also noted that the available evidence indicates Congress believes that the permissible size and weight of trucks are questions for state legislatures. CF responds: "Had Congress believed *Raymond* not to express its intent, it

could have passed legislation overruling that case." (Appellee's Brief at 25). Why would Congress bother to overrule a decision that the industry maintained and this Court stated applied only to statutes and facts peculiar to Wisconsin? Indeed, CF's suggestion is belied by the strenuous recent efforts of the ATA to obtain federal legislation preempting state length limitations less than 65 feet, efforts that would be unnecessary were it apparent to all that *Raymond* had required all states to allow 65-foot twins.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, as well as for the reasons set forth in our opening brief, the judgment of the Court of Appeals should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. MILLER
Attorney General of Iowa

MARK E. SCHANTZ
Solicitor General
Department of Justice
2nd Floor, Hoover Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
(515) 281-5191

ROBERT W. GOODWIN
Special Assistant Attorney General
Department of Transportation
Ames, Iowa 50010
(515) 296-1521

LESTER A. PAFF
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Transportation
Ames, Iowa 50010
(515) 296-1636

Attorneys for Appellants

APPENDIX

STATE LEGAL MAXIMUM LIMITS OF MOTOR VEHICLE SIZES AND WEIGHTS COMPARED WITH AASHO STANDARDS

Prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads, December 31, 1962.

Line	State	Width inches[1]	Height ft.-in	Length-feet[2]				Numbered of towed units[3]			Axle load-pounds				Gross weight limit			Specified maximum gross weight-pounds[4]						Practical maximum gross weight-pounds[5]						Line
				Single unit		Truck tractor semi-trailer	Other combination	Semi-trailer	Full trailer	Semi-trailer and full trailer	Single		Tandem		Type of restriction	Applicable to:		Truck		Truck-tractor semitrailer			Other combination	Truck		Truck-tractor semitrailer			Other combination	
				Truck	Bus						Statutory limit	Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Statutory limit	Including statutory enforcement tolerance		Any group of axles	Total wheel base only	2-axle	3-axle	3-axle	4-axle	5-axle		2-axle	3-axle	3-axle	4-axle	5-axle		
1	Alabama	96	13-6	35	40	50	NP	1	NP	NP	18,000	19,800	36,000	39,600	Table		X						27,800	47,600	47,600	60,010	64,650	NP	1
2	Alaska	96	12-6	35	[1]40	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		Table-tire cap.	Under 18'	Over 18'	36,000	50,000	50,000	72,000	76,800	76,800	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,800	2
3	Arizona	96	13-6	40	40	65	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,800	3
4	Arkansas	96	13-6	35	40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	[7]18,500	32,000	32,500	Spec. maximum[8]									26,500	40,500	45,000	59,000	65,000	65,000	4
5	California	96	13-6	35	[9]35	60	65	NR	NR	NR	18,000		32,000		Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	5
6	Colorado	[11]96	[12]13-6	35	40	60	[10]60	1	2	2	18,000		36,000		Formula-spec. limits		X													6
7	Connecticut	102	12-6	50	50	50	NP	1	NP	HP	22,400	22,848	36,000	36,720	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			30,000	45,000					26,000	44,000	44,900	62,000	76,000	76,000	7
8	Delaware	96	13-6	40	42	55	60	1	1	HP	20,000		36,000		Table-spec. limits[13]	X		32,000	50,000	50,000	60,000	60,000	NP	30,848	44,720	51,000	61,200	NP	NP	8
9	District of Columbia	96	12-6	40	40	50	50	1	1	NP	[6]22,400		38,000		Table	X		30,000	46,000	48,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	28,000	44,000	48,000	64,000	73,280	73,280	9
10	Florida	96	13-6	[14]35	40	55	55	1	1	NP	20,000	22,000	40,000	44,000	Table		X							30,000	46,000	52,000	[54]68,000	[54]70,000	[54]70,000	10
11	Georgia	96	13-6	[15]39	[15]45	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	20,340	36,000	40,680	Spec. maximum[16]									30,000	52,000	52,000	65,200	73,095	73,095	11
12	Hawaii	108	13-0	40	40	55	65	1	1	2	24,000		32,000		Formula[17]	X							63,280	28,340	48,680	48,680	63,280	63,280	80,000	12
13	Idaho	[11]96	14-0	35	[9]40	60	65	1	1	2	[20]18,000		[20]32,000		Table[20]	X								32,000	38,800	56,000	64,000	72,000	80,000	13
																								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	73,280	76,800	
14	Illinois	96	13-6	42	42	[25]55	60	1	1	2	[21]18,000		32,000		Spec. lim.-tire cap.															14
15	Indiana	[11]96	13-6	36	40	50	[25]50	1	1	2	[23]18,000	[21]19,000	[23]32,000	[23]33,000	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			36,000	[22]41,000	45,000	59,000	72,000	72,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	[23]73,000	15
16	Iowa	96	13-6	35	[9]40	50	50	1	[24]1	3	18,000	18,540	32,000	32,960	Table	X							72,000	27,000	41,000	45,000	59,000	[23]73,000	[23]73,000	16
17	Kansas	96	13-6	35	[9]46	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		Table	X								26,540	40,960	45,080	59,500	73,280	73,280	17
																								26,000	40,000	44,000	55,470	73,280	73,280	
18	Kentucky	96	[12]13-6	[26]35	[26]35	[27]50	[27]50	1	NP	NP	18,000	[28]18,900	32,000	[28]33,600	Spec. lim.-tire cap.[29]			27,000	42,000	42,000	59,640	73,280	NP	27,000	42,000	42,000	59,640	73,280	73,280	18
19	Louisiana	96	13-6	35	[9]40	55	60	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		Axle lim.-tire cap.									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	19
20	Maine	96	[10]12-6	55	55	55	55	1	1	NP	[30]22,000		[30]32,000		Table-tire cap.	X		32,000	[30]51,800	51,800	60,050	70,550	70,550	30,000	40,000	51,800	62,040	70,550	70,550	20
21	Maryland	[18]96	[6]12-6	55	55	55	[40]55	NR	NR	NR	22,400		[31]40,000		Formula		X			65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	30,400	48,000	52,800	65,000	65,000	65,000	21
22	Massachusetts	96	NR	35	[9]40	50	NP	1	NP	HP	22,400		36,000		Table-spec. limits			[32]46,000	[32]60,000	[32]60,000	[32]73,000	[32]73,000	NP	30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	73,000	NP	22
23	Michigan	96	13-6	35	40	55	55	1	1	2	[33]18,000		[34]32,000		Axle lim.-tire cap.									26,000	[35]40,000	44,000	[35]58,000	[35]66,000	[35]102,000	23
24	Minnesota	96	13-6	40	40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		Table	X						[36]73,280		26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	[36]72,000	72,500	24
25	Mississippi	96	13-6	35	40	55	55	1	1	HP	18,000		28,650	[35]32,000	Table-tire cap.	X								26,000	[35]40,000	44,000	59,000	[35]64,650	[35]64,650	25
26	Missouri	96	12-6	35	40	50	50	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		Table	X														
27	Montana	[11]96	13-6	35	40	60	60	1	1	[37]2	18,000		32,000		Table	Under 18'	Under 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	55,470	64,650	64,650	26
28	Nebraska	96	13-6	40	40	60	60	1	1	2	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	Table	X		36,000	54,000	54,000	71,146	71,146	71,146	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	76,000	76,000	27
29	Nevada	96	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	Table	Under 18'	Under 18'							26,780	41,200	45,320	59,740	73,280	73,280	28
																								26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	75,200	76,800	
30	New Hampshire	96	13-6	35	[9]40	50	50	NR	NR	NR	22,400		36,000		Tables-spec. limits		X													30
31	New Jersey	[41]96	[41]13-6	35	[39]35	50	[40]50	1	1	NP	22,400	23,520	32,000	33,600	Spec. limits			33,400	[38]47,500	52,800	66,400			30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	66,400	66,400	31
32	New Mexico	[41]96	13-6	40	40	65	65	1	1	2	21,600		34,320		Table	Under 18'	Over 18'	30,000	40,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	31,500	41,600	55,040	63,000	63,000	63,000	32
33	New York	96	[13]13-0	35	[42]35	50	50	1	1	NP	22,400		36,000		Formula		X					65,000	65,000	29,600	42,320	51,200	63,920	76,640	86,400	33
																								30,400	44,000	52,800	65,000	65,000	65,000	
34	North Carolina	96	[6]12-6	35	[9]40	[43]50	[43]55	1	1	NP	18,000	19,000	36,000	38,000	Spec. limits			31,500	46,200	46,200	65,100	65,100	65,100	27,000	46,000	46,000	65,100	65,100	65,100	34
35	North Dakota	[44]96	[45]13-6	[14]35	[9]40	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		Formula	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	60,000	[44]64,000	[44]64,000	35
36	Ohio	96	13-6	35	[9]40	50	60	1	NR	NR	19,000		31,500		Formula		X							27,000	39,500	46,000	58,500	71,000	78,000	36
37	Oklahoma	96	13-6	35	45	[45]60	[45]60	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	37
38	Oregon	96	[13]13-6	35	[9]40	[25][46]55	[9]65	1	1	[37]2	[47]18,000		[47]32,000		Table[48]	Under 18'	Over 18'													
39	Pennsylvania	96	[12]12-6	35	40	[50]50	[49]50	1	1	NP	22,400	23,072	36,000	37,080	Spec. limits[49]			33,000	47,000	50,000	60,000	[48]76,000	[48]76,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	[48]74,000	38
40	Puerto Rico	96	12-6	35	40	50	50	1	1	NP	NS		NS		Spec. lim.-tire cap.[43]							60,000	62,000	31,072	45,080	51,500	61,800	61,800	63,250	39
41	Rhode Island	102	12-6	40	40	50	50	1	1	NP	22,400		NS		Spec. limits			[50]36,000	[51]44,000	[52]50,000	[11]60,000	60,000	88,000	30,400	44,000	50,000	60,000	60,000	80,000	40
																														41
42	South Carolina	96	13-6	[14]35	[9]40	55	[53]60	1	1	NP	20,000		32,000		Table	X								28,000	40,000	48,000	60,000	66,839	71,115	42
43	South Dakota	96	13-6	35	40	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	43
44	Tennessee	96	[6]12-6	35	40	50	50	1	[54]1	NP	18,000		32,000		Table		X							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	61,580	63,500	44
45	Texas	96	13-6	35	40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	Table	X								26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	75,200	75,600	45
46	Utah	96	14-0	45	45	60	60	NR	NR	NR	18,000		[55]33,000		Table[55]	X								36,000	51,000	54,000	69,000	79,900	79,900	46
47	Vermont	96	12-6	50	50	50	50	1	1	NP	NS		NS		Spec. lim.-tire cap.			[55a]32,000	[55b]55,000	[55c]52,800	[55d]66,400	[55d]66,400	[55d]66,400	[55a]32,000	[55b]55,000	[55c]52,800	[55d]66,400	70,000	[55d]66,400	47
48	Virginia	96	13-6	35	40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		[57]32,000		Table	X						70,000	70,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	70,000	70,000	48
49	Washington	96	13-6	35	[9]40	60	[58]65	1	1	[58]2	18,000		32,000		Table	Under 18'	Over 18'	28,000	36,000	46,000	60,000	68,000	72,000	26,000	36,000	44,000	60,000	68,000	72,000	49
50	West Virginia	96	[6]12-6	35	[9]40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	Table	X					[66]70,000	[66]70,000	[66]70,000	26,900	41,600	45,800	57,844	63,840	63,840	50
51	Wisconsin	96	13-6	35	40	50	[67]50	1	1	NP	18,000	[60]19,500	30,400	32,000	Table[61]	X								27,500	40,000	47,000	59,500	73,000	73,000	51
52	Wyoming	96	13-6	40	40	65	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000	[62]36,000	Table	X								26,000	44,000	44,000	62,000	73,950	73,950	52
	AASHO Policy	96	12-6	35	[9]40	50	60	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		Table	X														
																								26,000	40,000	44,000	55,470	61,490	71,900	
Number of States	Higher	3	45	18	33	26	9	5	6	24	31		30		Formula 6									30	27	29	49	49	32	
	Same	49	7	34	14	26	13	47	42	28	21		21		Table 32	20	18							21	21	21	2	0	0	
	Lower	0	0	0	5	0	30	0	4	0	0		1		Specified limits 14									0	3	1	0	2	19	

NP–Not permitted. NR–Not restricted. NS–Not specified.

[1] Various exceptions for farm and construction equipment; public utility vehicles; house trailers; urban, suburban, and school buses; haulage of agricultural and forest products; at wheels of vehicles for safety accessories, on designated highways, and as administratively authorized.

[2] Various exceptions for utility vehicles and loads, house trailers and mobile homes.

[3] When not specified, limited to number possible in practical combinations within permitted length limits; various exceptions for farm tractors, mobile homes, etc.

[4] Legally specified or established by administrative regulation.

[5] Computed under the following conditions to permit comparison on a uniform basis between States with different types of regulation:

A. Front axle load of 8,000 pounds.

B. Maximum practical wheelbase within applicable length limits:

(1) Minimum front overhang of 3 feet.

(2) In the case of a 4-axle truck-tractor semitrailer, rear overhang computed as necessary to distribute the maximum possible uniform load on the maximum permitted length of semitrailer to the single drive-axle of the tractor and to the tandem axles of the semitrailer, within the permitted load limits of each.

(3) In the case of a combination having 5 or more axles, minimum possible combined front and rear overhang assumed to be 5 feet, with maximum practical load on maximum permitted length of semitrailer, subject to control of loading on axle groups and on total wheelbase as applicable.

C. Including statutory enforcement tolerances as applicable.

[6] Auto transports 13 feet 6 inches; Maryland also allows 13 feet 6 inches for vehicles loaded with hay or straw, or carrying flat glass.

[7] Does not apply to combinations of adjacent load-carrying single axles.

[8] 56,000 pounds on load-carrying axles, exclusive of steering-axle load.

[9] On specific routes in urban or suburban service under special permit from P.U.C. 40 feet, also 3-axle buses with turning radius less than 45 feet without restriction.

[10] Except 3-unit combinations may use up to 65 ft. combinations on certain highways designated by the Department of Highways.

[11] Buses 102 inches on highways of surfaced width at least 20 feet or otherwise as administratively authorized.

[12] On class AA, or designated highways, 12 ft. 6 in. on other highways; log and lumber trucks limited to 12 ft. 6 in. on all highways in Oregon.

[13] Legal limit 60,000 pounds, axle spacing 27 feet or more.

[14] Three-axle vehicles 40 feet.

[15] Truck 39.55 feet; bus 45.20 feet.

[16] 63,280 pounds maximum, except on roads under Rural Roads Authority 56,000 pounds maximum.

[17] 700 (L + 40) when L is 18' or less; 800 (L + 40) when L is greater than 18'; 900 (L + 40) on highways having no structures with span of 20' or over.

[18] Vehicles loaded with tobacco hogsheads–103 inches.

[19] Less than three axles 35 feet.

[20] Special limits for vehicles hauling timber and timber products, ores, concentrates, aggregates, and agricultural products including livestock; single axle 18,900 pounds, tandem axle 37,800 pounds, gross weight table: vehicle with 3 or 4 axles permitted 66,000 pounds maximum at 21-foot axle spacing, vehicle with 5 or more axles permitted 79,000 pounds maximum at 43-foot axle spacing.

[21] On designated highways; 16,000 pounds on other highways.

[22] Without tandem axles 45,000 pounds.

[23] On designated highways; single axle 22,400 pounds, tandem axle 36,000 pounds; tolerance of 1,000 pounds on total of all excesses of weight under one or more limitations of axle load and gross weight; depending upon the placing of 9000# on the front or steering axle.

[24] Towing agent must be registered for total gross weight of entire combination of vehicles except farmer having trailer registered as "Farm trailer."

[25] 60 ft. in special cases: Illinois, auto transports only; Indiana, trucks pulling house trailers only; Oregon, truck tractor semitrailers on designated major routes.

[26] On designated highways; trucks 26.5 feet and buses 30 feet on other highways.

[27] Class AA highways; 45 feet on other highways.

[28] Class AA highways only.

[29] Maximum gross weight on Class A highways 42,000 pounds; on Class B highways 30,000 pounds.

[30] Including load 14 feet; various exceptions for vehicles hauling forest products and construction materials.

[31] Tandem axles spaced less than 48 inches apart carry a gross weight limitation of 36,000 pounds.

[32] Subject to axle and tubular limits.

[33] Single axle spaced less than 9 feet from nearest axle limited to 13,000 pounds.

[34] On designated highways only and limited to one tandem axle in combination; otherwise 26,000 pounds.

[35] On designated highways only.

[36] Administrative regulation–32,000 pounds allowed on each set of tandem axles provided the distance between axles 2 and 5 is 28 ft. or more.

[37] Semitrailer and semitrailer converted to full trailer by means of a dolly.

[38] Dual-drive axles; otherwise 40,000 pounds.

[39] Or as prescribed by P.U.C.

[40] Exception for poles, pilings, structural units, rawing sheets etc., permitted 70 feet.

[41] On designated highways 102 inches. Body restricted to 96", additional 6" for tires only.

[42] Trackless trolleys and buses 7 passengers or more, P.S.C. certificate 40 feet.

[43] Including front and rear bumpers.

[44] Vehicles in excess may be operated under special permit obtained in advance from the Department of Motor Vehicles, in North Dakota, from State Highway Truck Regulatory Department.

[45] Auto transports only, by special permit only, otherwise 50 feet.

[46] Any single axle exceeding 18,000 lbs. shall be equipped with 4 properly inflated tires.

[47] Logging vehicles permitted 7-foot wheelbase tolerance, 19,000-single axle, 34,000-pound tandem axle.

[48] Governs gross weight permitted on highways designated by resolution of State highway commission.

[49] Single unit truck with 4 axles permitted 60,000 pounds.

[50] Axles spaced less than 6 feet 32,000 pounds; less than 12 feet 36,000 pounds; 12 feet or more gross weight governed by axle limit.

[51] Single vehicle with 3 or more axles spaced less than 16 feet 40,000 pounds; less than 20 feet 44,000 pounds; 20 feet or more governed by axle limit.

[52] Tractor semitrailer with 3 or more axles spaced less than 22 feet 46,000 pounds; not less than 27 feet 50,000 pounds.

[53] Limited to 3,500 pounds.

[54] Several bridges posted at lower limits.

[55] On Interstate Routes: a. 30,000 lbs.; b. 40,000 lbs.; c. 50,000 lbs.; d. 60,000 lbs.

[56] Where truck-tractor was properly registered in Pennsylvania as of December 31, 1961, 55 feet.

[57] Vehicles registered before July 1, 1956, permitted limits in effect January 1, 1956, for life of vehicle.

[58] Three-unit combinations and full truck and full trailer combinations on designated highways.

[59] House trailers only, otherwise 55 feet.

[60] Axle load 21,000 pounds on 2-axle trucks hauling peeled or unpeeled forest products cut crosswise or transporting milk from farm to market but not over Interstate System.

[61] On Class A highways. All axles of a vehicle or combination–73,000 pounds maximum. Wheel, axle, axle group and gross vehicle weights on Class B highways are 60% of weights including tolerance authorized for Class A highways.

[62] Based on ruling of Attorney General.

[63] Weight limits to be established by administrative regulations.

[64] For axle spacing under 8 feet.

[65] Weights are established on axle spacing of the extreme of any group.

[66] Only on certain highways, or portions thereof, designated by State Roads Commissioner, and consistent with Congressional action.

[67] Mobile house and towing vehicle–50 feet except Noon to Midnight Sundays and other designated holidays.

STATE LEGAL MAXIMUM DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS OF MOTOR VEHICLES COMPARED WITH AASHO STANDARDS

Prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads

December 31, 1963

Line	State	Width inches[1]	Height ft.-in.	Length-feet[2] Single unit: Truck	Bus	Semi-trailer or trailer	Truck tractor semi-trailer	Other combination	Number of towed units[3]: Semi-trailer	Full trailer	Semi-trailer and full trailer	Axle load-pounds: Single: Statutory limit	Single: Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Tandem: Statutory limit	Tandem: Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Operating tire inflation pressure pounds per sq. in.	Gross weight limit: Pounds per engine net horsepower delivered to clutch or equivalent	Type of restriction	Applicable to: Any group of axles	Applicable to: Total wheelbase only	Specified maximum gross weight-pounds[4]: Truck: 2-axle	Truck: 3-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 3-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 4-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 5-axle	Other combination	Practical maximum gross weight-pounds[5]: Truck: 2-axle	Truck: 3-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 3-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 4-axle	Truck-tractor semitrailer: 5-axle	Other combination	Line
1	Alabama	96	13-6	40	40	NS	55	NP	1	NP	NP	18,000	19,800	36,000	39,600	NS	NS	Table		X												1
2	Alaska	96	12-6	35	[6]40	40	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table or tire cap.	Under 18'	Over 18'												2
3	Arizona	96	13-6	40	40	NS	65	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'	36,000	50,000	50,000	72,000	73,280 76,800	76,800	27,800	47,600	47,600	67,400	73,280	NP	3
4	Arkansas	96	13-6	40	40	NS	55	55	1	1	NP	[8]18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Spec. maximum									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,800	4
5	California	96	13-6	35	[9]35	[7]40	60	65	NR	NR	NR	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,800	5
6	Colorado	[10]96	[11]13-6	35	40	NR	60	[13]60	1	2	2	18,000		36,000		NS	NS	Formula-spec. lim.		X							26,000	44,000	44,000	62,000	76,000	76,000	6
7	Connecticut	102	12-6	50	50	NR	50	NP	1	NP	2	22,400	22,848	36,000	36,720	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			32,000	53,800	53,800	67,400	73,000	NP	30,848	44,720	53,800	67,400	73,000	NP	7
8	Delaware	96	13-6	40	42	40	55	60	1	1	NP	20,000	22,000	36,000	44,000	NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.	X		30,000	46,000	48,000				28,000	44,000	48,000	64,000	73,280	80,000	8
9	Florida	96	13-6	[12]35	40	[14]NS	55	55	1	1	NP	20,000		40,000		NS	NS	Table		X							30,000	52,000	52,000	73,271	73,271	73,271	9
10	Georgia	96	13-6	[15]39	[15]45	NR	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		36,000		NS	NS	Spec. max.[16]															10
11	Hawaii	108	13-0	40	40	NR	55	65	1	1	2	24,000		32,000		NS	NS	Formula[17]	X														11
12	Idaho	[10]96	14-0	[18]35	[18]35	NR	[19]60	65	1	1	2	[20]18,000		[20]32,000		NS	NS	Table[20]	X							63,280	28,340	48,680	48,680	63,280	63,280	63,280	12
13	Illinois	96	13-6	42	42	42	[21]55	[22]60	1	1	2	[23]18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.									32,000	40,000	56,000	64,000	72,000	80,000	13
14	Indiana	[10]96	13-6	36	40	NR	55	[21]55	1	1	2	[25]18,000	[25]19,000	[25]32,000	[25]33,000	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			36,000	50,000	50,000	64,000	[24]73,280	[24]73,280	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	73,280	76,800	14
15	Iowa	96	13-6	35	[6]40	[7]NS	[26]55	[26]55	1	1	2	18,000	18,540	32,000	32,960	NS	NS	Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	73,280	76,800	15
16	Kansas	96	13-6	35	[6]40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X								26,000	40,960	45,080	59,500	73,280	73,280	16
17	Kentucky	96	[11]13-6	[27]35	[27]35	NR	[28]50	[28]50	1	1	NP	18,000	[29]18,900	[29]32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap[30]			27,000	42,000	42,000	59,640	73,280	NP	27,000	42,000	42,000	59,640	73,280	73,280	17
18	Louisiana	96	13-6	35	[6]40	NR	55	60	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	18
19	Maine	102	[31]13-6	55	55	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	[32]22,000		[31]32,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X		32,000	[31]51,800	51,800	62,050	73,280	73,280	30,000	40,000	51,800	62,000	72,000	73,280	19
20	Maryland	[33]96	[34]12-6	55	55	NR	55	[34]55	NR	NR	NP	22,400		[35]40,000		NS	NS	Table	X	X	[36]65,000	[36]73,280	[36]73,280	[36]73,280	[36]73,280	[36]73,280	30,400	48,000	52,800	70,400	73,280	73,280	20
21	Massachusetts	96	NS	35	[6]40	NR	50	NP	1	NP	NP	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.			[36]46,000	[36]60,000	[36]60,000	[36]73,000	[36]73,000	NP	30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	73,000	NP	21
22	Michigan	96	13-6	35	40	40	55	55	1	1	2	[37]18,000		[38]32,000		NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.									26,000	[22]40,000	44,000	[22]58,000	[22]66,000	[22]102,000	22
23	Minnesota	96	13-6	40	40	40	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	23
24	Mississippi	96	13-6	35	40	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000		28,650	[22]32,000	NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X								26,000	[23]40,000	44,000	58,000	[22]64,650	[22]73,280	24
25	Missouri	96	12-6	35	40	NR	50	50	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X						73,280	73,280	26,000	44,000	44,000	58,000	[22]72,000	[22]73,280	25
26	Montana	[10]96	13-6	35	40	NR	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	26
27	Nebraska	96	13-6	40	40	[39]NR	60	60	1	1	2	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	X		36,000	54,000	54,000	71,146	71,146	71,146	26,780	41,200	45,320	59,740	73,280	76,000	27
28	Nevada	96	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	75,200	76,800	28
29	New Hampshire	96	13-6	35	[22]40	NR	55	55	NR	NR	NR	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.		X	33,400	[40]55,000	[40]55,000	66,400	73,280	73,280	30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	73,280	73,280	29
30	New Jersey	[41]96	[41]13-6	35	[42]35	[7]40	53	50	1	1	NP	22,400	23,520	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.									31,520	41,600	55,040	65,120	73,280	73,280	30
31	New Mexico	[43]96	13-6	40	40	NR	65	65	1	1	2	21,600		34,320		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							29,600	42,320	51,200	63,920	76,640	86,400	31
32	New York	96	[33]13-0	35	[44]35	[7]NR	50	50	1	1	2	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Formula		X							30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	71,000	71,000	32
33	North Carolina	96	13-6	35	[6]40	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000	19,000	36,000	38,000	NS	NS	Spec. lim.			31,500	49,875	49,875	67,200	71,000 73,280	71,000 73,280	27,000	46,000	46,000	65,000	73,280	73,280	33
34	North Dakota	[41]96	[41]13-6	[18]35	[6]40	NR	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Formula									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	34
35	Ohio	96	13-6	35	[6]40	[7]40	55	60	1	1	2	18,000		31,500		NS	NS	Formula	Under 18'	Over 18'							27,000	39,500	46,000	58,500	71,000	78,000	35
36	Oklahoma	96	13-6	35	45	NR	[45]50	[45]50	1	1	NP	19,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	36
37	Oregon	96	[11]13-6	35	[22]40	[23]40	[21]55	[22]65	1	1	[22]2	[46]18,000		[46]32,000		NS	NS	Table[47]	Under 18'	Over 18'					[47]76,000	[47]76,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	[47]76,000	37
38	Pennsylvania	96	[33]12-6	35	40	40	[48]50	[34]50	1	1	NP	22,400	23,072	36,000	37,080	NS	NS	Spec. lim.[49]			33,000	47,000	50,000	60,000	71,145	71,145	31,072	45,080	51,500	61,800	73,280	73,280	38
39	Rhode Island	102	12-6	40	40	40	50	50	1	1	NP	22,400		NS		NS	NS	Spec. lim.			[50]36,000	[51]44,000	[52]53,800	[53]67,400	73,280	88,000	30,400	44,000	53,800	67,400	73,280	88,000	39
40	South Carolina	96	13-6	40	[6]40	NR	55	[54]60	1	1	NP	20,000		[55]32,000		NS	NS	Spec. lim.			32,000	46,000	50,000	65,000	73,280	73,280	28,000	40,000	48,000	60,000	72,000	73,200	40
41	South Dakota	96	13-6	35	40	NR	[22]65	[22]65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	41
42	Tennessee	96	13-6	35	40	[7]NS	50	50	1	[56]1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	43,500	42
43	Texas	96	13-6	35	40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X	X		44,000	48,000	62,000	73,280		26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	72,000	43
44	Utah	96	14-0	45	45	45	60	60	NR	NR	NR	18,000		33,000		NS	NS	Table	X		36,000	51,000	54,000	69,000	79,900 73,280	79,900 73,280	26,000	41,000	44,000	59,000	74,000	79,900	44
45	Vermont	96	13-6	50	50	NS	55	60	1	1	NP	22,400	23,520	[57]36,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X								31,520	44,000	55,000	66,400	73,280	73,280	45
46	Virginia	96	13-6	35	40	NR	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		[58]32,000		NS	NS	Table	X														46
47	Washington	96	13-6	35	[6]40	40	[19]60	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'	28,000	36,000	46,000	60,000	70,000 68,000	70,000 72,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	60,000	70,000	70,000	47
48	West Virginia	96	[33]12-6	35	[6]40	35	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	X					[59]70,000	[59]70,000	[59]70,000	26,000	36,000	44,000	60,300	68,000	68,000	48
49	Wisconsin	96	13-6	35	40	35	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000	[60]19,500	30,400	32,000	NS	NS	Table [61]	X								26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	73,280	73,280	49
50	Wyoming	96	13-6	40	40	NR	65	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000	[62]36,000	NS	NS	Table	X								27,500	40,000	47,000	59,500	73,000	73,000	50
51	District of Columbia	96	12-6	40	40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	22,000		38,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X														51
52	Puerto Rico	96	12-6	35	40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	NS		NS		NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.	X														52
	AASHO Policy	102	13-6	40	40	40	55	65	1	1	2	20,000		32,000		95	400	Table		X				70,000	70,000	70,000	26,000 30,000	44,000 46,000	44,000 52,000	62,000 68,000	73,950 70,000	73,950 70,000	50
Number of States	Higher	1	4	7	10	35	14	1	5	7	6	16		26		52	52	Formula 5									28,000	40,000	48,000	60,000	72,000	86,500	51
	Same	3	37	12	37	7	20	9	47	42	18	2		25		0	0	Table 32	20	17							15	25	15	22	24	2	52
	Lower	48	11	33	5	10	18	42	0	3	28	34		1		0	0	Spec. lim. 15									2	24	2	3	19	0	
																											34	2	34	26	8	49	

NP–Not permitted. NR–Not restricted. NS–Not specified.

[1] Various exceptions for farm and construction equipment; public utility vehicles; house trailers; urban, suburban, and school buses; haulage of agricultural and forest products; at wheels of vehicles for safety accessories, on designated highways, and as administratively authorized.

[2] Various exceptions for utility vehicles and loads, house trailers and mobile homes.

[3] When not specified, limited to number possible in practical combinations within permitted length limits; various exceptions for farm tractors, mobile homes, etc.

[4] Legally specified or established by administrative regulation.

[5] Computed under the following conditions to permit comparison on a uniform basis between States with different types of regulation:

A. Front axle load of 8,000 pounds.

B. Maximum practical wheelbase within applicable length limits:

(1) Minimum front overhang of 3 feet; minimum spacing from first to second axle of truck tractor 8 feet.

(2) In the case of a 4-axle truck-tractor semitrailer, rear overhang computed as necessary to distribute the maximum possible uniform load on the maximum permitted length of semitrailer to the single drive-axle of the tractor and to the tandem axles of the semitrailer, within the permitted load limits of each.

(3) In the case of a combination having 5 or more axles, minimum possible combined front and rear overhang assumed to be 5 feet, with maximum practical load on maximum permitted length of semitrailer, subject to control of loading on axle groups and on total wheelbase as applicable.

C. Including statutory enforcement tolerance as applicable.

[6] Less than three axles 35 feet.

[7] Trailer 35 feet.

[8] Steering axle 12,000 pounds.

[9] On specific routes in urban or suburban service under special permit from P.U.C. 40 feet, also 3-axle buses with turning radius less than 45 feet without restriction.

[10] Buses 102 inches on highways of surfaced width at least 20 feet or otherwise as administratively authorized.

[11] On class AA, or designated highways, 12 ft. 6 in. on other highways; log and lumber trucks limited to 12 ft. 6 in. on all highways in Oregon.

[12] Except 3-unit combinations may use up to 65 ft. combinations on certain highways designated by the Department of Highways.

[13] Three-axle vehicles 40 feet.

[14] Two-axle trailer 35 feet; three-axle trailer 40 feet.

[15] Truck 39.55 feet; bus 45.20 feet.

[16] 63,280 pounds maximum, except on roads under Rural Roads Authority 56,000 pounds maximum.

[17] 700 (L + 40) when L is 18' or less; 800 (L + 40) when L is greater than 18', 900(L + 40) on highways having no structures with span of 20' or over.

[18] On designated highways 40 feet.

[19] Auto transports on designated highways 65 feet.

[20] Special limits for vehicles hauling timber and timber products, ores, concentrates, aggregates, and agricultural products including livestock: single axle 18,900 pounds, tandem axle 37,800 pounds, gross weight table: vehicle with 3 or 4 axles permitted 66,000 pounds maximum at 21-foot axle spacing, vehicle with 5 or more axles permitted 79,000 pounds maximum at 43-foot axle spacing.

[21] 60 ft. in special cases: Illinois, auto transports only; Indiana, trucks pulling house trailers only; Oregon, truck tractor semitrailers on designated major routes.

[22] On designated highways only.

[23] On designated highways, 16,000 pounds on other highways.

[24] Axle spacing 46 feet or more; otherwise 72,000 pounds.

[25] On designated highways; single axle 22,400 pounds, tandem axle 36,000 pounds; tolerance of 1,000 pounds on total of all excesses of weight under one or more limitations of axle load and gross weight, depending upon the placing of 9000# on the front or steering axle.

[26] Auto and boat transports and three-unit combinations permitted 60 feet on highways with surface width 22 feet or more; otherwise 50 feet.

[27] On designated highways; trucks 26.5 feet and buses 30 feet on other highways.

[28] Class AA highways; 45 feet on other highways.

[29] Class AA highways only.

[30] Maximum gross weight on Class A highways 42,000 pounds,; on Class B highways 30,000 pounds.

[31] Including load 14 feet; various exceptions for vehicles hauling forest products and construction materials.

[32] Vehicles loaded with tobacco hogsheads–103 inches.

[33] Auto transports 13 feet 6 inches; Maryland also allows 13 feet 6 inches for vehicles loaded with hay or straw, or carrying flat glass.

[34] Exception for poles, pilings, structural units, rowing sheelss etc., permitted 70 feet.

[35] Less than 48-inch spacing, 36,000 pounds.

[36] Subject to axle and tabular limits.

[37] Single axle spaced less than 9 feet from nearest axle limited to 13,000 pounds.

[38] On designated highways only and limited to one tandem axle in combination; otherwise 26,000 pounds.

[39] Trailer 40 feet.

[40] On Interstate System 47,500 pounds.

[41] Vehicles in excess may be operated under special permit obtained in advance, in New Jersey from the Department of Motor Vehicles; in North Dakota, from State Highway Truck Regulatory Department.

[42] Or as prescribed by P.U.C.

[43] On designated highways 102 inches. Body restricted to 96", additional 6" for tires only.

[44] Trackless trolleys and buses 7 passengers or more, P.S.C. certificate 40 feet.

[45] Auto transports, oil field equipment, by special permit only, 60 feet.

[46] Logging vehicles permitted 7-foot wheelbase tolerance, 19,000-single axle, 34,000-pounds tandem axle.

[47] Governs gross weight permitted on highways designated by resolution of State highway commission.

[48] Where truck-tractor was properly registered in Pennsylvania as of December 31, 1961, 55 feet.

[49] Single unit truck with 4 axle permitted 60,000 pounds.

[50] Axles spaced less than 6 feet 32,000 pounds; less than 12 feet 36,000 pounds; 12 feet or more gross weight governed by axle limit.

[51] Single vehicle with 3 or more axles spaced less than 16 feet 40,000 pounds, less than 20 feet 44,000 pounds, 20 feet or more governed by axle limit.

[52] Tractor semitrailer with 3 or more axles spaced less than 22 feet 46,000 pounds, not less than 27 feet 53,800 pounds.

[53] Legal limit 67,400 pounds, axle spacing 27 feet or more.

[54] House trailers only, otherwise 55 feet.

[55] On Interstate System, 36,000 pounds on other roads.

[56] Limited to 3,500 pounds.

[57] Three-axle tandem 42,700 pounds.

[58] Vehicles registered before July 1, 1956, permitted limits in effect January 1, 1956, for life of vehicle.

[59] Only on certain highways, or portions thereof, designated by State Roads Commissioner, and consistent with Congressional action.

[60] Axle load 21,000 pounds on 2-axle trucks hauling peeled or unpeeled forest products cut crosswise or transporting milk from farm to market but not over Interstate System.

[61] On Class A highways. All axles of a vehicle or combination–73,000 pounds maximum. Wheel, axle, axle group and gross vehicle weights on Class B highways are 60% of weights including tolerance authorized for Class A highways.

[62] Based on ruling of Attorney General.

STATE LEGAL MAXIMUM DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS OF MOTOR VEHICLES COMPARED WITH AASHO STANDARDS

Prepared by the American Association of State Highway Officials

December 31, 1967

Line	State	Width inches[1]	Height ft.-in.	Length-feet[2] Single unit: Truck	Bus	Semi-trailer or trailer	Truck tractor semi-trailer	Other combination	Number of towed units[3]: Semi-trailer	Full trailer	Semi-trailer and full trailer	Axle load-pounds: Single: Statutory limit	Single: Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Tandem: Statutory limit	Tandem: Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Operating tire inflation pressure pounds per sq. in.	Gross weight limit: Pounds per engine net horsepower delivered to clutch or equivalent	Type of restriction	Applicable to: Any group of axles	Total wheelbase only	Specified maximum gross weight-pounds[4]: Truck: 2-axle	3-axle	Truck-tractor semi-trailer: 3-axle	4-axle	5-axle	Other combination	Practical maximum gross weight-pounds[5]: Truck: 2-axle	3-axle	Truck-tractor semi-trailer: 3-axle	4-axle	5-axle	Other combination	Line
1	Alabama	96	13-6	40	40	NS	55	NP	1	NP	NP	18,000	19,800	36,000	39,600	NS	NS	Table		X													1
2	Alaska	96	13-6	40	[2]40	[2]40	60	65	1	1	2	20,000		34,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	Under 18'	Over 18'	30,000	44,000	50,000	64,000	73,280 78,000	100,000	27,800	47,600	47,600	67,400	73,280	NP	2
3	Arizona	96	13-6	40	40	NS	65	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							28,000	42,000	48,000	62,000	76,000	90,000	3
4	Arkansas	96	13-6	40	40	NS	55	65	NR	NR	NR	[4]18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Spec. maximum									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,800	4
5	California	96	[4]13-6	40	40	[2]40	60	65	NR	NR	NR	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	5
6	Colorado	[1]96	[1]13-6	35	40	NR	60	[2]60	1	2	2	18,000		36,000		NS	NS	Formula-spec. lim.		X							26,000	44,000	44,000	62,000	76,000	76,000	6
7	Connecticut	102	13-6	55	55	40	55	NP	1	NP	NP	22,400	22,848	36,000	36,720	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			32,000	53,800	53,800	67,400	73,000	NP	30,848	44,720	53,800	67,400	73,000	NP	7
8	Delaware	96	13-6	40	42	40	55	60	1	1	NP	[6]20,000		36,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.	X		30,000	65,000	48,000				28,000	44,000	48,000	64,000	73,280	73,280	8
9	Florida	96	13-6	[1]35	40	[14]NS	55	55	1	1	NP	20,000	22,000	40,000	44,000	NS	NS	Table		X							30,000	52,000	52,000	73,271	73,271	73,271	9
10	Georgia	96	13-6	55	55	NR	55	55	NR	NR	NR	18,000	20,340	36,000	40,680	NS	NS	Spec. max.[15]															10
11	Hawaii	108	13-0	40	40	NR	55	65	1	1	2	24,000		32,000		NS	NS	Formula[17]	X								28,340	48,680	48,680	69,110	73,280	73,280	11
12	Idaho	[1]96	14-0	[18]39	[18]39	NR	[19]60	[18]65	1	1	2	[20]18,000		[20]32,000		NS	NS	Table[21]	X								32,000	40,000	56,000	64,000	72,000	80,000	12
13	Illinois	96	13-6	42	42	42	[21]55	60	1	1	2	[21]18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			36,000	50,000	50,000	64,000	[24]73,280	[24]73,280	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	73,280	76,800	13
14	Indiana	[1]96	[22]13-6	36	40	NR	55	65	1	1	2	[25]18,000	[25]19,000	[25]32,000	[25]33,000	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.									26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	[25]73,000	[25]73,000	14
15	Iowa	96	13-6	35	[2]40	[2]NR	[26]55	[26]55	1	1	2	18,000	18,540	32,000	32,960	NS	NS	Table	X		36,000	50,000	54,000			72,000	26,540	40,960	45,080	59,500	73,280	73,280	15
16	Kansas	96	13-6	42'6"	[2]40	42'6"	55	[6]50	NR	NR	NR	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table		X							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	16
17	Kentucky	96	13-6	[27]35	[27]35	NR	[26]55	[6]65	1	1	2	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.			30,000	44,000	44,000	62,000	73,280	73,280	27,000	42,000	42,000	59,640	73,280	73,280	17
18	Louisiana	96	13-6	35	[2]40	NR	60	65	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.															18
19	Maine	[28]102	[11]13-6	55	55	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	[11]22,000		[29]36,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X		32,000	[11]51,600	51,800	66,300	73,280	73,280	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	19
20	Maryland	[1]96	13-6	55	55	NR	55	[30]65	NR	NR	NR	22,400		[29]40,000		NS	NS	Table				[11]55,000	[11]65,000	[16]73,280	[16]73,280	73,280	30,000	44,000	51,800	66,000	73,280	73,280	20
21	Massachusetts	96	NS	35	[2]40	NR	55	NP	1	NP	NP	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.		X	[11]46,000	[11]60,000	[11]60,000	[31]73,000	[16]73,000	NP	30,400	48,000	52,800	65,000	73,280	73,280	21
22	Michigan	96	13-6	35	40	40	[1]55	[32]65	1	1	2	[33]18,000		[34]32,000		NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.															22
23	Minnesota	96	13-6	40	40	[35]40	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X						73,280		26,000	[36]40,000	44,000	[36]58,000	[36]66,000	[36]102,000	23
24	Mississippi	96	13-6	35	40	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000		28,650	[37]32,000	NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X						73,280	73,280	26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	24
25	Missouri	96	13-6	40	40	NR	55	[2]50	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table		X							[36]26,000	[36]40,000	[36]44,000	[36]58,000	[36]72,000	[36]73,280	25
26	Montana	[1]96	13-6	35	40	NR	60	60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	76,000	26
27	Nebraska	96	13-6	40	40	[38]NR	60	60	1	1	2	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	X		36,000	54,000	54,000	71,146	71,146	71,146	26,780	41,200	45,320	59,740	73,280	73,280	27
28	Nevada	96	NR	40	40	NR	[4]70	[4]70	NR	NR	NR	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	75,200	76,800	28
29	New Hampshire	96	13-6	35	40	NR	55	55	NR	NR	NR	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.		X	33,400	[4]55,000	52,800	66,400	73,280	73,280	30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	73,280	73,280	29
30	New Jersey	[4]96	[4]13-6	35	[4]35	[2]40	55	50	1	1	NP	22,400	23,520	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Axle lim.-tire cap.									31,520	41,600	55,040	65,120	73,280	73,280	30
31	New Mexico	[4]96	13-6	40	40	NR	65	65	1	1	2	21,600		34,320		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'							29,600	42,320	51,200	63,920	76,640	86,400	31
32	New York	96	13-6	35	40	35	55	55	1	1	NP	22,400		36,000		NS	NS	Formula		X							30,400	44,000	52,800	66,400	71,000	71,000	32
33	North Carolina	96	13-6	35	[2]40	NR	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000	19,000	36,000	38,000	NS	NS	Spec. lim.			31,500	49,875	49,875	67,200	71,000 73,280	71,000 73,280	27,000	46,000	46,000	65,000	73,280	73,280	33
34	North Dakota	[4]96	[4]13-6	[1]35	[2]40	NR	[1]60	[1]60	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Formula	Under 18	Over 18'							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	34
35	Ohio	96	13-6	40	[2]40	NR	55	65	1	NR	NR	19,000	19,570	[39]32,000	32,960	NS	NS	Formula[41]		X							27,000	39,500	46,000	58,500	71,000	78,000	35
36	Oklahoma	96	13-6	40	45	NR	[40]55	65	1	1	NS	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X		[42]18,000	[42]32,000	[42]36,000	[42]50,000	[42]64,000 [42]76,000	73,280 [42]76,000	26,000 [43]28,000	42,000 [43]42,000	44,000 [43]48,000	60,000 [43]62,000	73,280 [43]76,000	73,280 [43]76,000	36
37	Oregon	96	[6]13-6	35	[2]40	[2]40	[2]60	[2]75	1	1	[2]2	[44]20,000		[44]34,000		NS	NS	Table	X														37
38	Pennsylvania	96	13-6	35	40	40	55	[45]55	1	1	NP	22,400	23,072	36,000	37,080	NS	NS	Spec. lim.[46]			33,000	47,000	50,000	60,000	71,145	71,145	31,072	45,080	51,500	61,800	73,280	73,280	38
39	Rhode Island	102	13-6	40	40	40	55	55	1	1	NP	22,400		NS		NS	NS	Spec. lim.			[47]36,000	[47]44,000	[47]53,800	[47]67,400	73,280	88,000	30,400	44,000	53,800	67,400	73,280	88,000	39
40	South Carolina	96	13-6	[2]40	[2]40	NR	55	[2]55	1	1	NP	20,000		[48]32,000		NS	NS	Spec. lim.			35,000	46,000	50,000	65,000	73,280	73,280	28,000	40,000	48,000	60,000	72,000	73,280	40
41	South Dakota	96	13-6	35	40	NR	[2]65	[2]65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table		X							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	73,280	41
42	Tennessee	96	13-6	40	40	NS	55	55	1	[49]1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table-spec. lim.		X							26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	43,500	42
43	Texas	96	13-6	40	40	[2]40	55	65	NR	NR	NR	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X		44,000	48,000	62,000	73,280			26,000	40,000	44,000	58,000	72,000	72,000	43
44	Utah	96	14-0	45	45	45	60	60	NR	NR	NR	18,000		33,000		NS	NS	Table	X		36,000	51,000	54,000	69,000	79,900	79,900	26,000	41,000	44,000	59,000	74,000	79,900	44
45	Vermont	96	13-6	50	50	NS	55	55	1	1	NP	22,400	23,520	[3]36,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X						73,280	73,280	31,520	44,000	55,000	66,400	73,280	73,280	45
46	Virginia	96	13-6	35	40	NR	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000		[50]32,000		NS	NS	Table		X													46
47	Washington	96	13-6	35	[2]40	40	[1]60	65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	Under 18'	Over 18'	28,000	36,000	46,000	60,000	70,000	70,000	26,000	40,000	44,000	60,000	70,000	70,000	47
48	West Virginia	96	[51]12-6	35	[2]40	35	50	50	1	1	NP	18,000	18,900	32,000	33,600	NS	NS	Table	X					[16]70,000	[16]70,000	[16]70,000	26,000	36,000	44,000	60,000	68,000	72,000	48
49	Wisconsin	96	13-6	35	40	35	55	55	1	1	NP	18,000	[6]19,500	30,400	32,000	NS	NS	Table[41]	X								26,900	41,600	45,800	60,500	73,280	73,280	49
50	Wyoming	96	13-6	50	40	NR	65	[1]65	1	1	2	18,000		32,000	[6]36,000	NS	NS	Table	X								27,500	40,000	47,000	59,500	73,000	73,000	50
51	District of Columbia	96	12-6	40	40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	22,000		38,000		NS	NS	Table-tire cap.	X								26,000	44,000	44,000	62,000	73,950	73,950	51
52	Puerto Rico	96	13-6	35	40	NS	50	50	1	1	NP	NS		NS		NS	NS	Spec. lim.-tire cap.	X						70,000	70,000	30,000	46,000	52,000	68,000	70,000	70,000	52
	AASHO Policy - 1946	96	12-6	35	40		50	60	1	1	NP	18,000		32,000		NS	NS	Table	X								26,000	40,000	44,000	55,470	61,490	71,900	
Number of States	Higher	4	50	29	8		48	20	9	11		20		29													28	28	27	51	51	45	
	Same	48	2	[23]	41		4	7	43	38		32		23													23	21	23	0	0	0	
	Lower	0	0	0	3		0	25	0	3		0		0													0	2	1	0	0	6	
	AASHO Policy - 1968	102	13-6	40	40	40	55	65	1	1	2	20,000		32,000		95	400	Table	X								28,000	40,000	48,000	60,000	72,000	86,500	
Number of States	Higher	1	4	9	8	37	15	2	9	11	11	16		29													15	28	15	24	25	3	
	Same	3	45	19	41	12	32	18	43	38	19	4		23													4	21	4	4	20	0	
	Lower	48	3	24	3	3	4	32	0	3	22	32		0				[Formula 5; Table 33; Spec. lim. 14]	18	21							32	2	32	23	6	48	

NP—Not permitted. NR—Not restricted. NS—Not specified.

[1]Various exceptions for farm and construction equipment, public utility vehicles, house trailers, urban, suburban and school buses, haulage of agricultural and forest products, at wheels of vehicles for safety accessories, on designated highways, and as administratively authorized.

[2]Various exceptions for utility vehicles and loads, house trailers, mobile homes and urban, suburban and school buses.

[3]When not specified, limited to number possible in practical combinations within permitted length limits, various exceptions for farm tractors, mobile homes, etc.

[4]Legally specified or established by administrative regulation.

[5]Computed under the following conditions to permit comparison on a uniform basis between States with different types of regulation:

A. Front axle load of 8,000 pounds.

B. Maximum practical wheelbase within applicable length limits:

(1) Minimum front overhang of 3 feet, minimum spacing from first to second axle of truck tractor 8 feet.

(2) In the case of a 4-axle truck-tractor semitrailer, rear overhang computed as necessary to distribute the maximum possible uniform load on the maximum permitted length of semitrailer to the single drive-axle of the tractor and to the tandem axles of the semitrailer, within the permitted load limits of each.

(3) In the case of a combination having 5 or more axles, minimum possible combined front and rear overhang assumed to be 5 feet, with maximum practical load on maximum permitted length of semitrailer, subject to control of loading on axle groups and on total wheelbase as applicable.

C. Including statutory enforcement tolerance as applicable.

[6]Less than three axles 35 feet.

[7]Trailer 35 feet.

[8]Steering axle 12,000 pounds.

[9]Load on vehicle may exceed 13' 6" but not exceed 14' 0", in effect until January 1, 1970.

[10]Buses 102 inches on highways of surfaced width at least 20 feet or otherwise as administratively authorized.

[11]On class AA, or designated highways, 12 ft. 6 in. on other highways.

[12]Except 3-unit combinations may use up to 65 ft. combinations on certain highways designated by the Department of Highways.

[13]Three-axle vehicles 40 feet.

[14]Two-axle trailer 35 feet, three-axle trailer 40 feet.

[15]Auto transports permitted 63 feet.

[16]73,280 pounds maximum, except on roads under Rural Roads Authority 56,000 pounds maximum.

[17]700 (L + 40) when L is 18' or less; 800 (L + 40) when L is greater than 18', 900 (L + 40) on highways having no structures with span of 20' or over.

[18]On designated highways 40 feet.

[19]Auto transports on designated highways 65 feet, if equipped as specified.

[20]Special limits for vehicles hauling timber and timber products, ores, concentrates, aggregates, and agricultural products including livestock, single axle 18,900 pounds, tandem axle 37,800 pounds, gross weight table - vehicle with 3 or 4 axles permitted 66,000 pounds maximum at 21-foot axle spacing, vehicle with 5 or more axles permitted 79,000 pounds maximum at 43-foot axle spacing.

[21]60 ft. in special cases. Illinois, auto transports only. Indiana, trucks pulling house trailers and sectionalized buildings only. Oregon, truck tractor semi-trailers on designated major routes, otherwise 50 feet.

[22]On designated highways only.

[23]On designated highways, 16,000 pounds on other highways.

[24]Axle spacing 44 feet or more, otherwise 72,000 pounds.

[25]On designated highways, single axle 22,400 pounds, tandem axle 36,000 pounds, tolerance of 1,000 pounds on total of all successes of weight under one or more limitations of axle load and gross weight, depending upon the placing of 9000 # on the front or steering axle.

[26]Auto and boat transports and three-unit combinations permitted 60 feet on highways with surface width 22 feet or more, otherwise 50 feet for all combinations.

[27]On state maintained highways, trucks 26.5 feet and buses 30 feet on other highways.

[28]On Interstate System only maximum width 96 inches, tandem axle load 32,000 pounds, 3-axle truck—40,000 pounds, 4-axle truck-tractor semitrailer—62,000 pounds, 5-axle truck-tractor semitrailer 72,000 pounds.

[29]Class AA highways only.

[30]On four lane highways only.

[31]Including load 14 feet, various exceptions for vehicles hauling forest products and construction materials.

[32]Vehicles loaded with tobacco hogsheads—103 inches.

[33]Auto transports 13 feet 6 inches, other vehicles 13 feet 6 inches on designated routes.

[34]Exception for poles, pilings, structural units, rowing sheels etc., permitted 70 feet.

[35]Less than 48-inch spacing, 36,000 pounds.

[36]Subject to axle and tabular limits.

[37]Single axle spaced less than 9 feet from nearest axle limited to 13,000 pounds.

[38]On designated highways only and limited to one tandem axle in combination, otherwise 26,000 pounds.

[39]Trailer 40 feet.

[40]On Interstate System 47,500 pounds.

[41]Vehicles in excess may be operated under special permit obtained in advance, in New Jersey from the Department of Motor Vehicles, in North Dakota, from State Highway Truck Regulatory Department.

[42]Or as prescribed by P.U.C.

[43]On designated highways 102 inches. Body restricted to 96", additional 6" for tires only.

[44]32,000 pounds if over 4 feet but less than 8 feet apart, 24,000 pounds if less than 4 feet apart, 38,000 pounds if more than 8 feet.

[45]Auto transports, oil field equipment, by special permit only, 60 feet.

[46]On Interstate System logging vehicles limited to 19,000 pound single axle, other vehicles limited to 18,000 pound single axle and 32,000 pound tandem axle.

[47]Governs gross weight permitted on highways designated by resolution of State highway commission.

[48]Does not apply if overall length of truck tractor plus semitrailer does not exceed 50 feet.

[49]Single unit truck with 4-axle permitted 60,000 pounds.

[50]Axles spaced less than 6 feet 32,000 pounds, less than 12 feet 36,000 pounds, 12 feet or more gross weight governed by axle limit.

[51]Single vehicle with 3 or more axles spaced less than 16 feet 40,000 pounds; less than 20 feet 44,000 pounds, 20 feet or more governed by axle limit.

[52]Tractor semitrailer with 3 or more axles spaced less than 22 feet 46,000 pounds, not less than 27 feet 53,800 pounds.

[53]Legal limit 67,400 pounds, axle spacing 27 feet or more.

[54]House trailers, auto transports, and double saddle mounts in daylight hours, 60 feet.

[55]On Interstate System, 36,000 pounds on other roads.

[56]Limited to 3,500 pounds.

[57]Three axle truck, 42,700 pounds on tandem.

[58]Vehicles registered before July 1, 1956, permitted limits in effect January 1, 1956, for life of vehicle.

[59]Only on certain highways, or portions thereof, designated by State Roads Commissioner, and consistent with Congressional action.

[60]Axle load 21,000 pounds on 2-axle trucks hauling peeled or unpeeled forest products cut crosswise or transporting milk from farm to market but not over Interstate System.

[61]On Class A highways. All axles of a vehicle or combination—73,000 pounds maximum. Wheel, axle, axle group and gross vehicle weights on Class B highways are 60% of weights including tolerance authorized for Class A highways.

[62]Based on ruling of Attorney General.

[63]Axle load 21,700 pounds on 3-axle trucks. Total not to exceed 65,000 pounds. Does not apply on any Interstate Route or Turnpike.

[64]Except three or four unit combinations may use up to 98 feet on certain highways designated by the Board of Highway Directors.

[65]60 feet for specially designed transports for boats or motor vehicles 65 feet for other combinations on designated highways.

[66]45 feet for trailers or semi-trailers constructed especially to haul livestock, boats or motor vehicles.

[67]Weight known plus front steering axle not to exceed 18,000 pounds.

[68]Auto transports 14 feet by permit on designated highways.

[69]On Interstate System—26,000, 40,000, 44,000, 58,000 and 72,000 pounds respectively.

[70]Mobile Homes and sectionalized buildings 12 feet 6 inches.

[71]38,000 plus 900 L but not greater than 78,000 where L is the distance in feet from front to rear axle.

[72]Auto transports permitted 60 feet. Double bottom units permitted 65 feet.

[73]Not yet specified in any state law.